



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,881	11/05/2003	Robert A. Guenther	200309963-1	6718
22879	7590	08/23/2007	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			PARRIES, DRU M	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2836				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/23/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/701,881	GUENTHER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dru M. Parries	2836	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date . . .
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: . . .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on May 7, 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:



8/20/07

MICHAEL SHERRY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 18-22, filed May 7, 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 5, 6, 12, 15, 20-22 and 26 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Pedyash et al. (2004/0217881).

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11, 17, and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, the Examiner would like to note that the phrase "independent and redundant input" can be reasonably interpreted in a couple different ways, and the Examiner believes that both his way and the Applicant's way is a valid interpretation of that phrase. There can be more than one way to reasonably interpret a claim, and the key to getting around broad interpretations is to be specific in your claim language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 3-15, 17-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art (Admission) and Pedyash et al. (2004/0217881). Admission teaches a power source (+48V), a first set of isolated converters (105), a plurality of subsets of non-isolated converters (110) and an intermediate bus (100) to supply independent and redundant input to the second set

of converters from the first set of converters. He also teaches the non-isolated converters being selectively combined to generate one or more selected output levels. (Fig. 1) Admission fails to teach the intermediate bus comprising multiple independent buses and the types of loads that the system is powering. Pedyash teaches first converters (840 and 860) producing a plurality of intermediate voltages, to a second converter (850) among other elements, on multiple independent buses (+3.3V and +1.5V) to supply power to electronic components of a computer system at different output voltages, without fault protection components. (Figs. 2 and 8a) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to reconfigure the intermediate bus (100) to have the outputs of the first converters of Admission (105) each on their own independent bus to be able to supply power to specific second converters (110), making a one-to-one relationship, so that one first converter's output will not be affected if another first converter is malfunctioning. Also, it can provide a more precise input voltage to the specific second converters (110) and in turn create a more efficient system. Also, due to the reconfiguration of the intermediate bus (100), there would be no need for fault protection components that were used to prevent faults within the first converters from affecting the common intermediate bus (100). Also, it would have been a matter of design choice to selectively connect the independent output buses of the first converters (105) to certain second converters (110) since the Applicant has not disclosed that doing so in a specific configuration solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally as well under any connection configuration. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the components being powered being part of a computer system, since Admission was silent as to the type of system (loads)

being powered and Pedyash teaches a system known in the art that uses this type of power distribution method.

7. Claims 2 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art (Admission) and Pedyash et al. (2004/0217881) as applied to claims 1, 11, and 13 above, and further in view of De Rooij et al. (2004/0125618). Admission and Pedyash teach the power distribution system described above. Admission fails to explicitly teach what is inside the power converters. De Rooij teaches a power converter comprising a power transformer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a power transformer into all of the converters in Admission because De Rooij teaches converters comprising transformers and Admission is silent as to what the converter comprises.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dru M. Parries whose telephone number is (571) 272-8542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday from 9:00am to 6:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Sherry, can be reached on 571-272-2800 x 36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMP

8-15-2007



MICHAEL SHERRY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800